

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 388

HE 021 252

AUTHOR Peters, Dianne S.; Peterson, Margaret
TITLE Rites of Passage for Doctoral Students in Higher Education. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Baltimore, MD, November 21-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Environment; *College Faculty; Doctoral Degrees; *Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Peer Relationship; *Postsecondary Education as a Field of Study; *Social Influences; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

Over 150 doctoral students and faculty in U.S. programs for the study of higher education were interviewed to determine their views concerning the social context of these programs. Both faculty respondents (including program directors) and doctoral students perceived the social context of the programs to involve a plurality and diversity of students. Faculty did not agree about the mission of their program, and students perceived an ambiguity and conflict in purpose. Students were unsure of the criteria that faculty used to allocate their time among students for advisement and other purposes. They were also uncertain of criteria that faculty used to identify students who were seriously committed or involved in the study of higher education and to ascertain the degree of professionalism that students have already attained. Consideration was also given to: joining a group for academic purposes while in graduate school, the role of faculty in developing a program's social context, privileges and responsibilities of group membership, and actions and behaviors connected to leaving the social context. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 292388

rites of passage for doctoral students in higher education

by

Dianne S. Peters and Margaret Peterson

HE 021 252

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dianne S. Peters

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
- ☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.



ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Sheraton Inner Harbor Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland, November 21-24, 1987. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

RITES OF PASSAGE FOR DOCTORAL STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

Dianne S. Peters and Margaret Peterson

The purpose of this paper is to continue reporting what happens to doctoral students after they enroll in programs for the study of higher education. At first, the focus was on the formal monitoring routines (e.g., an exam) used to evaluate student progress, ¹ and these were derived mainly from the perspective of program directors. Almost immediately the focus broadened to include the context in which the monitoring routines took place. Such a context is a social one; it deals with groups of people who engage together in work and play activities. Anthropologically, social context means relationships between an individual and the work or play group that one has or seeks to become a member of. ² Thus, the title "rites of passage" symbolizes relationships between the individual and group. At present the concern is with what individual respondents, who are faculty and doctoral students in U.S. programs for the study of higher education, perceive when they view social context in those programs.

Description emphasizes what and not how much, and such a distinction means that this investigation is characterized by qualitative research methodology. Here, the emphasis is on the quality of what the respondent says about his or her work and play environment and not just the percentage of respondent comment from a sample or population. As Smith ³ points out in her listing of criteria appropriate to judging qualitative research, questions of how many, how much, or even "replicability" are often irrelevant. Of relevance is that qualitative research is hermeneutic or interpretive; ⁴ it deals with meanings. Meanings need context - social context in this case - and thus descriptions that are full, rich, and thick with contextual detail enable the researcher to make meaning. Readers use the detail that researchers provide in order to understand "the what" of the context even though they may argue about its overall meaning.

In this sense the idea of context is akin to culture, which may be defined somewhat simplistically as what groups of people do and how they do it. Groups in this study are faculty and doctoral students who work and sometimes play together in programs for the study of higher education. That is to say, culture is a generic term which subsumes both formal and informal constructs. Such an operating definition of culture is different from that in the "saga" of Clark ⁵ or the "culture sans organization" of Masland, ⁶ both of whom tend to regard things organizational as things formal, and things informal as things cultural. In this study culture denotes things formal and informal.

All of this is to say that, as qualitative research, our investigation rests on fundamental principles of anthropology - for example, describe before you prescribe or proscribe. In short, this investigation utilizes "grounded theory" ⁷ in which data drive theory, not the other way round. Put another way, researchers gather

data about a culture by means of a process called triangulation in which data come from observation (e.g., of behaviors), from documentation (e.g., of curriculum tabs) and, most importantly, from interviewing "primary respondents" (who are analogous to an historian's primary sources). These data tend to form categories and patterns unique to the culture under investigation; i.e., the categories and patterns are not predeterminable. Once discovered or revealed, however, they suggest theoretical or conceptual constructs. It is this entire process that is grounded theory and in such a process theory derives from data and not the other way round.

Primary respondents in this, the second phase of the research investigation include program directors (some "new" and some interviewed previously in the first phase of the study), faculty ("adjunct," part-time, and full-time), and "advanced" doctoral students (who had completed their degree or were at the major exam-proposal stage) both full-, and part-time in higher education programs throughout the country, no university type or geographic region being absent. All told, there have been upwards of 150-175 interviews, some by phone, and others by letter, depending on the preference of the respondent. There are more faculty than students, about a 3:2 ratio, and the gender split for both faculty and student groupings is about even. Of each respondent we asked the same questions:

1. What is your definition of the term social context or social group?
2. What actions or behaviors indicate that a doctoral student has become part of a social group? (This is the "rites passage" question.)
3. What is the faculty role in developing the social context or social group?
4. What privileges and responsibilities accrue to the doctoral student with group membership?
5. What actions or behaviors indicate an exit from the group?

The task now is to organize answers to these questions into some sort of categories or patterns that make meaning, remembering all the while that the answers are not exact, that they may well lead to better questions (and in qualitative research asking a "right" question is always better than obtaining the precise answer to a "wrong" question), and that whatever meaning one makes is subject to different nuances of interpretation.

FINDINGS

1. Defining the social context or social group

Both faculty respondents (including program directors) and doctoral students perceive the social context of their programs to exist in the plural. That is, most doctoral students in most programs for the study of higher education are part-time students who are working outside the program in either full-time or part-time

capacities. Although there may be a "cadre" or "cohort" of full-time students (often on scholarship or stipend of some sort) toward which part-time students may gravitate or be drawn, the prevalent pattern is that of groupings of part-time students. Such groups include those who work full-time on the university campus (e.g., as assistant registrar or librarian) and come to class in the late afternoon or early evening, those who work part-or full-time off-campus either locally or at a distance (e.g., as faculty and/or administrators at a community college) and commute to classes, and those who are finished with coursework and are "dissertating" on their own, on or off-campus, working part- or full-time.

That there are different groups of doctoral students, even those who are part-time, is less important than what the differences mean, and meanings are different according to whether the respondent is a faculty member or a doctoral student. Faculty say that part-time students in their programs contribute to "formlessness" or "atomism," a condition they find uncomfortable. Often faculty develop this theme historically: "Twenty years ago [a faculty person] could count on there being a nucleus of students working full bore toward completing the doctorate. Now, students are increasingly part-time and diverse, so it's increasingly difficult to get much continuity or coherence in what I do."

The idea of "atomism," a word used by several faculty respondents to describe one effect of part-time student enrollment, seems to have little effect on doctoral students' engaging in program activities, however; that is, boundaries are permeable, and no difficulties occur when students cross them. On the other hand, atomism affected faculty work in an adverse way. The following statement is illustrative: "We know our students are increasingly diverse and older. We know they have 'multiple commitments' to things outside the program. We've read Pat Cross. We know these outside commitments need to be taken into account when we design instruction. But, are our higher education programs becoming more compassionate than rigorous? more given to grade inflation? less concerned with clear and precise writing? more prone to granting graduate credit for workshops or other on-the-job training activities?" And the implied answer seems to be, "Unfortunately, yes, and it bodes ill for our program."

It is the notion of on-the-job training that especially disturbs faculty, for they connect it to the plurality or diversity of students. On the whole, faculty reject the study of higher education as on-the-job training, and they say they must combat this attitude from students, especially part-time students who have a tendency to put "studying higher education on a par with eliminating crab grass from the front lawn," as one respondent said. Yet, if faculty are in accord about what studying higher education is not, they are not in agreement about what it is or what the mission or their program is or should be.

Respondents list program mission in these terms:

1. more than the union card or job ticket (although faculty are realistic enough to accept such a motivating factor,

- especially from beginning doctoral students),
2. an opportunity to become professional,
 3. a commitment to be involved with the academic profession,
 4. learning about higher education for its own sake,
 5. a commitment to learning for its own sake.

All or some combination of these goal statements are usually present in the content of any single faculty respondent, and so ambiguity of mission seems to be part of the pattern making up social context.

Moreover, such ambiguity seems apart from the dichotomy of Ph. D. versus Ed. D. ⁹ - (which was never mentioned by any faculty respondent) or the "researcher-scholar versus the practicing professional." Given the diversity and ambiguity of mission, the questions, "Are we producing researcher-scholars like ourselves or are we producing professional practitioners for management positions?" seem too pat because the answer to both questions is Yes, and each program seems to be searching for its own balance or proportion in this regard. Nonetheless, there seems to be a tendency for programs to emphasize the theoretical aspects of studying higher education rather than the work-a-day and practical, but that emphasis does not seem necessarily to indicate a direction toward a researcher-scholar goal.

Turning to the responses of doctoral students about defining the social group or context, we find that students also perceive a plurality or diversity of clientele as well as an ambiguity and conflict in purpose. Students also agree with faculty that the boundaries between and among part-time, full-time students are "porous" and so, as one doctoral student said, "subgroupings are more inclusionary than exclusionary." Moreover, faculty and students agree that "involvement in" or "commitment to" the study of higher education is a factor contributing to success, although students pointed to the obvious factor of academic weakness in those who did not finish the degree.

Points of difference between faculty and students in ascribing meanings to the plurality of social context cluster on two concerns. First, students noted that faculty were hard-pressed for time to devote to students and they were unsure about the criteria faculty used to decide whom to devote time to (e.g., for advisement) or the criteria signaling their own and other students' "serious commitment or involvement" - criteria, that is, beyond that of "high-quality academic performance." Wondering about such criteria led students to a consideration of program mission, yet nowhere in their commentary is the notion that one might study higher education to be a researcher-scholar. Rather, they simply asked, "Does the program exist for professional administrative practice?" and they did not bring up on-the-job-training as a topic for comment.

Students are concerned about professionalism, and this is the second major point of difference between faculty and student respondents. Students, especially part-time students, do not perceive

faculty uniformly taking into account the professionalism that students say they have by virtue of their job experience. It is not that faculty seem to regard students as unprofessional, they say, but that faculty don't always see the "professional seasoning" that students say comes with their prior work experience in academic administration. Underlying these cross-currents may be the distinction between experience and expertise: students have the former but not the latter, whereas faculty oftentimes have both.

To summarize, when faculty and doctoral students in programs for the study of higher education define social context, they point to similar subcultures of clientele that suggest plurality, not just a duality of part-time and full-time. Respondents differ, however, in their interpretations of that plurality. For faculty, there is much conflict in mission, in finding some sort of fit between different missions and different groups of students. For students, there is much uncertainty about program goals and about the criteria applied to them as people who say they have considerable professionalism already.

2. Becoming a group member

Overwhelmingly, the one phrase faculty respondents used to describe those actions and behaviors of doctoral students in attaining group membership was "getting connected." By this phrase faculty usually meant joining a group for academic purposes (e.g., studying together for an exam) more so than for informal pleasantries (e.g., having a bite to eat together after a class session). For faculty, then, getting connected carries the connotation of academic work, of students' cooperating rather than competing and, paradoxically, of students' functioning with increasing independence in class discussions and written work. Faculty also said getting connected meant that part-time students moved more toward full-time status or being involved with activities similar to those of full-time students (e.g., assuming leadership roles in a formally recognized graduate student organization). Another connotation for getting connected is illustrated by the phrase "using resources aggressively," which means anything and everything from the metaphorical "not sitting in the back row of a classroom" and the idea of reading critically beyond the assignments to the idea of not being dissuaded by an aloof faculty stance or of trying to write well enough to produce a report worthy of being considered for publication. In all and for faculty, getting connected is strongly oriented to the nuances of "academic work."

Put another way, faculty tend to downplay getting connected as personal or informal, although they certainly indicated it is important for students to have other students as friends to care about them and their individual problems. At issue in this regard is emphasis, not mutual exclusivity. Faculty stress the academic and professional connotations more so than the personal. Faculty also tend to dismiss student's previous work experience as part of such a connotation; that is, whatever position a student may hold does not, from the faculty perspective, seem to be an important criterion for group membership.

The student perspective is quite different. Student respondents do not talk about getting connected. They talk about joining a group for reasons that include studying together, but more importantly for having friends "in the same boat" (the "boat" seems to be named "misery loves company") with whom one can have a drink, play handball, find a sympathetic ear when things go awry, and share previous on-the-job experiences. Thus, students emphasized the personal and the individual moreso than the academic and the professional.

In brief, the distinction between faculty and student views of joining a social group in the context of a program for the study of higher education is the distinction between work and play (remembering that "play" in this sense does not connote frivolity or even triviality). Faculty perceive students primarily to join a professional work group which does not take previous work experience into account; students perceive themselves primarily joining an informal "support" or "play" group which does take note of prior work experience.

3. Generating the Social Group: The Faculty Role

Both sets of respondents say that faculty play a crucial role in developing a program's social context. Both sets of respondents also say that it is important for students to interact with one another cooperatively, yet simultaneously for students to be able to work and play independently. "A paradox," said one faculty member, "so accept it as such."

Moreover, both faculty and students evidently mean the same sort of thing by the faculty role, for both sets of respondents report faculty taking the same behaviors and actions to foster and support context. As examples: get-togethers at a faculty person's home, celebrations organized by students and faculty to honor another student's performance (e.g., passing exams, defending a proposal), back-to-back course schedulings so that commuter students have only one late-night drive home per week, regular times when faculty and students can gather at a local pub or coffee shop, volleyball team practice. These examples clearly indicate that the context for belonging to a group is important and both faculty and students seem to appreciate it when everyone concerned participates as fully as possible.

The one small difference between faculty and student in these matters is that faculty talk about the need for systematic attention to their encouraging students "to get connected," whereas no student respondent mentioned the idea of "system." On the one hand, faculty tend to lament that they give short shift-i.e., do not give systematic attention - to those activities that foster student interaction. On the other hand, they also point to personal idiosyncracies among their colleagues that prevent systematic attention, to being hard-pressed for time to devote to such activities, and to the fact that such activities are not rewarded - "they're hardly recognized at all," said one faculty member apparently wishing they were.

The differences of being "systematic" about the faculty role in

encouraging group interaction notwithstanding, there is consensus about the importance of getting connected. Faculty actions in this regard may be overt, - e.g., organizing a party at one's home or offering one's home for a student-organized celebration-or the actions may be covert,- e.g., "they [the faculty] set up group interaction and let it happen, watching it happen as if from behind a one-way mirror," said one student respondent. In all, that faculty help student interaction along seems more important than how the interaction is helped along.

4. Privileges and Responsibilities of Group Membership

Once students become members of a social group, certain privileges are accorded to them and certain responsibilities are expected of them. With regard to the privileges of group membership, faculty are quite clear about what follows when a student joins the social context, whereas students are less clear. For example, student respondents tend not to see privileges except in retrospect. "Once a grad student always a grad student," they say, "but as I think about it I see that ..." What they see is that group membership confers the privilege of collegial treatment from their peers and from their faculty - using first names, being understood and taken seriously, for example. They also see that group membership gives them access to faculty who, in turn, give them time, research ideas, comments on their papers, and so on.

Faculty respondents also see that group membership carries with it a collegiality, but faculty are much more detailed about the benefits of group membership. They say that being part of the social context gives students access to faculty (meaning themselves their time, their research ideas and or interests, and their critical commentary) but also to tangible privileges such as being eligible for funding for full-time study, being awarded a graduate assistantship, having a desk in an office or office space, being able to use office equipment (photocopier, computer, word processor, ditto machine, coffee pot), and having keys to that office where the equipment and other related materials are kept. Thus, when respondents say that one privilege of group membership is having access to faculty in their offices, faculty respondents delineate tangible benefits from having access to faculty, whereas students speak simply of having access to faculty.

Responsibilities accruing with group membership are perceived similarly by both faculty and students, although there are minor differences. Overwhelmingly, both groups say that supporting other students in the group in academic and personal ways is THE most important responsibility. Next in importance is exhibiting academic integrity, by which both faculty and students mean calling out claptrap where it occurs, confronting superficiality, reading and listening critically, and not condoning shoddiness or glib name-dropping. In these two areas of responsibility - i.e., mutual support and academic integrity - faculty and students clearly demonstrate almost the same views.

Differences between the groups are small. Although both faculty and students believe that it is a student's responsibility to

participate appropriately in departmental (program) decision-making when asked, faculty also state that it is the student's responsibility as a member of the higher education community to write well. Student respondents tended not to mention writing at all, except to voice concern over their own "illegible penmanship and lousy spelling," as one respondent said.

In all, the privileges and responsibilities of being a member of the social context are similar whether the respondent is a student or a faculty person.

5. Exiting the Social Context

Comments from faculty and student respondents regarding the ways in which a doctoral student leaves a program for the study of higher education fall into two discrete topics. The first could be entitled "The Extended Family," an anthropological term connoting close relationships between and among kin who are at varying degrees of genealogical distance from an ego or "I" on a kinship chart; more simply, extended family means "living with" grandparents, cousins, uncles, aunts, etc., whereas "nuclear family" means only mother-father-children living together. The second topic concerns attrition and addresses characteristics of doctoral students who leave a program for the study of higher education without completing the degree. We shall take up these topics in reverse order because the topic of "non-finishers" is more easily addressed, while the topic of extended family is denser and more complex. Besides, the idea of extended family brings us round full circle to connect with the diversity-plurality of part-time students who predominate in nearly all programs for the study of higher education.

Characteristics of Non-Finishing Doctoral Students. The main difference between student and faculty views of "non-finishers" is that students bring up the topic themselves and faculty do not; only if asked to consider attrition do faculty make comment about it. If they answer the question at all, they say they expect all who are admitted to complete and only "after the fact" do they ascribe reasons for a student's having "faded away." In short, faculty tend to keep contacting these students - they badger, cajole, coerce, "bug" - until such behavior seems futile. For faculty, then, time to finish seems less important than the act of finishing. Student views of non-finishers, on the other hand, are readily forthcoming; perhaps they are closer to the conditions surrounding attrition.

Student respondents point to the following reasons for another student's not finishing the degree: first and by far the most prevalent is personal or familial considerations; a student leaves because he or she is moving away often to another job which pays more money and thus makes things easier for the family as a whole. Other, lesser reasons for not finishing include an inability to "get on" with other students and with faculty (i.e., not adjusting one's behaviors and actions to the norms and mores of the social context), and a failure either to pass the major examination or to defend successfully (or perhaps to settle on a topic for) a thesis proposal. When asked, and only then, faculty respondents list the same reasons for someone's not finishing and in the same sequence. Faculty also suggest that an

incoming student's perception of what it means to study higher education never becomes quite reconciled to the actuality of studying higher education. Mostly, faculty tend not to mention "failure" (of exams or proposal); rather, they say, "hasn't passed yet."

The Idea of an Extended Family:

The argument concerning extended family begins with both faculty and student respondents stating that being part of the social context in a higher education program is like being part of a big family - once you belong you never leave. Conversely, they say, if one has never joined, then there is nothing to exit from. Further, the joint view is that these statements hold whether or not a student completes the doctorate, although all respondents believe that finishers are more likely than not to have been part of the social context. There is also a collective perception that becoming part of a social group either generates a professional network or connects one with a professional network already in existence. If the former, then finishers become active alumni and come to know other alumni as well as to retain ties to a program's faculty. If the latter, then finishers connect with administrators, researchers, and others who are members of professional organizations. It is also quite possible, respondents say, to meld these two networks (alumni and professional societies) into one large network.

At this juncture in the extended family argument faculty respondents offer a corollary. They talk about the interrelationship between the "cohesiveness" or "consistency" of a program's context and the relatively large proportion of enrolled students (especially full-time students) in a program. They say, "There's a coherence and a recognizable style in a program such as the one at Ann Arbor or Penn State that I don't find in the program at this university or any other program I've been associated with." The respondents then pause. After a moment they say, "You know, there's an awful lot of A-B-D-ism in these programs. To be sure, we as faculty don't give up on students, but many of them just don't finish." Another pause. "Perhaps if there were less diversity...fewer part-timers...less atomism..." and their speech dwindles into a silent pondering.

With the faculty's unfinished thought in this regard we come full circle, for we recall faculty respondent comment about diversity leading to atomism, a lowering of professional standards, an apparent lack of continuity in faculty relations with students - all told, an incoherence that has a negative effect on faculty work. Students themselves seem unaffected by these matters, but their alternatives as doctoral students are limited either in terms of knowledge about other programs or historical tracings of programs. Only when doctoral students complete the degree do they look back over their experiences, combine that view with their current expertise, and approach a view somewhat congruent with that of the faculty.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

From the foregoing findings about (1) defining the social group context for doctoral students in U.S. higher education programs, (2) specifying actions and behaviors to indicate membership in the context, (3) assigning a faculty role to forging cohesiveness in the

social context, (4) delineating privileges and responsibilities that accrue with group membership, and (5) listing actions and behaviors that speak to exiting the social context, we offer the following conclusions:

1. There is little doubt that the social context formed by work and play (academic and personal, formal and informal) groups is significant for success in completing the doctorate. Although not all doctoral students participate as group members, those who do complete the degree tend to participate more so than those who do not. Further, faculty tend to perceive social context serving primarily academic, professional purposes and their actions are directed toward that end. Doctoral students seem to believe that the social context serves primarily personal and less academic purposes, and this view seems underscored by their believing themselves already well seasoned professionally.

2. The predominance of doctoral students who are enrolled part-time in higher education programs contributes strongly to a plurality and diversity of social context. These students exhibit varying degrees of professional seasoning which, together with the vagaries of part-timism in general, affects faculty work. Specifically, the diversity contributes to a lack of continuity or coherence in the ways faculty can relate to students of different types and, to some extent, the ways students can and do interact with one another. There is also a relationship between plurality and diversity occasioned by part-time students and the incidence of A-B-D's, but the precise nature of this relationship is unknown.

3. Finally, where there are marked differences between faculty and students, ambiguity follows. For faculty, ambiguity of program mission is perhaps best described as a conflict between preparing students to be researcher scholars or administrative and professional practitioners, not between Ph.D. and Ed.D. degree programs. For students, however, the goal of research-scholar is not an issue; instead, after overcoming some apparent confusion between on-the-job training and higher education as a field for graduate-level study, students tend to regard program mission as centering on professional administrative practice.

Nonetheless, it bears repeating that the predominance of part-time students in higher education programs fractures the surface context and generates discontinuities for faculty and for students themselves, both full- and part-time. The idea of multiple commitments, for example, exerts pressures: first, for faculty, the need to do research and to serve campus and academic communities is fractured by an overall instructional process which proceeds in fits and starts; for students, supporting a family with decreased time and fiscal resources for such responsibilities, taking courses which sometimes do not relate directly to one's immediate job, and being unsure of where one stands with one's peers and faculty are all cross currents that contribute to a fits and starts environment. In such an environment people have difficulty maintaining stability.

Such surface fissures contribute to understandable gaps between faculty and doctoral students. Faculty, for example, believe the

(11)

primary purpose of social context to be academically oriented toward a student's becoming a full-blown professional - this, despite faculty awareness of people's needs for individuals who care about them as individuals. On the other hand, student views are reversed; they regard the purpose of social context to be for personal support, believing themselves to be full-blown professionals already.

Another fissure exists between faculty and students over program purpose. Faculty are torn between wanting to prepare students as researcher-scholars for the field as a whole or as administrators whose professional practice occurs in an institutional setting. While there is theoretical and conceptual overlap between these two purposes, there is also enough controversy to be discomfiting. Moreover, in this controversy there is no mention of any kind of schism between Ph. D. and Ed. D.; evidently, that sort of concern does not relate to program purpose, at least not at the present time.

Students, however, are not torn between researcher-scholar and professional practitioner. For them, the over-arching purpose of a doctoral program in higher education is practitioner oriented, most often in an institutional context although occasionally in a state commission or system context. This orientation does not mean that students are immune to the controversy faculty feel over program purpose. It affects students apparently in their wondering what criteria are being applied that will eventually win them access to a mentor or an advisory committee.

In all, this second phase of a three-phase study has revealed what at face value look like potential problem areas. Since data collection is still ongoing, it is premature to offer recommendations for improving the social context (or social groupings) in programs for the study of higher education in the U.S. We can describe that social context in fairly rich detail, and we can ascribe some meanings to the detailed description, but until we assess outcomes and discover a theoretical or conceptual apparatus to explain the overall social context, further comment is inappropriate.

NOTES

¹ Dianne S. Peters and Margaret Peterson, "Monitoring and Evaluating Doctoral Student Progress in Programs for the Study of Higher Education." ASHE 1987 Annual Meeting Paper. Resources in Education, No. ED281432 (Sept. 1987).

² E.E. Evans-Pritchard, The Nuer. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940; and Social Anthropology. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1952.

³ Mary Lee Smith, "Publishing Qualitative Research," American Educational Research Journal, V.24, no.2 (1987), pp. 173-183.

⁴ Jonas Soltis, "On The Nature of Educational Research", Educational Researcher V.13(1984), pp. 69-71.

⁵ Burton Clark, "The Organizational Saga in Higher Education," Administrative Science Quarterly, V. 17, no.2 (1972), pp.178-184.

⁶ Andrew T. Masland, "Organizational Culture in the Study of Higher Education," Review of Higher Education, V.8, no.2 (1985), pp. 157-168

⁷ Clifton F. Conrad, "A Grounded Theory of Academic Change", Sociology of Education, V.51 (1978), pp. 101-112; Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Chicago: Aldine, 1967; and John H. Chilcott, "Where Are You Coming From and Where Are You Going? The Reporting of Ethnographic Research," American Educational Research Journal, V.24, no. 2(1987), pp. 199-218.

⁸ For a full explanation see Chilcott: and Soltis: cited above.

⁹ David Dill and James L. Morrison, "Ed.D. and Ph.D. Research Training in the Field of Higher Education: A Survey and a Proposal," Review of Higher Education V.8, no. 2 (1985), pp. 169-186.